DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 100 SO 024 443

AUTHOR Mayton, Daniel M., II
TITLE Universalism Values: Blueprint for Environmental Concern.
PUB DATE Aug 93
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (101st, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ecology; Environmental Education; Global Approach; Higher Education; Social Science Research; *Social Values; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Empirical research has consistently shown human values to be significantly related to both attitudes and behaviors. This paper unites the value theories of several researchers into an explanation of environmental concern, and provides some preliminary data to support the model. Attitudes toward environmental choices should be determined by underlying value orientations. The universalism value type, which takes a primary place within this model, includes the social values of equality, a world of beauty, a world at peace, social justice, unity with nature, and protecting the environment. Individuals who place a high priority on these universalism values should hold pro-environmentalism attitudes and advocate pro- environmentalism activities. The value types of benevolence and power take a secondary position. This study utilized written survey methodology to assess the relationships between values, global consciousness, and environmental concern. The results of this study can be interpreted in the context of three levels of environmentalism: (1) a biospheric orientation with a concern for the welfare of nonhuman species and the entire biosphere; (2) a concern for the welfare of other human beings; and (3) egotism or self-interest. If environmental concern at the biospheric orientation level exists, the universalism values would need to be overwhelmingly strong. Results of this study support the thesis that the value types of universalism, benevolence, and power are predictive and important in understanding environmental concern and so can be of use to teachers in developing environmental concern in their students as part of a social studies curriculum. Three illustrative tables conclude the paper. Contains 8 references. (Author/DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 100

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Universalism Values:

Blueprint for Environmental Concern

Daniel M. Mayton II

Lewis-Clark State College

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DANIEL M. MAYTON II

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the 101st annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, CANADA, August 21, 1993. Requests for reprints can be made to the Department of Psychology, Lewis-Clark State College, Lewiston, Idaho, 83501, U.S.A. or through BitNet at LCDAN @ IDUI1.

SO 024 443

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Empirical research has consistently shown human values to be significantly related to both attitudes and behaviors (e.g. Ball-Rokeach, Rokeach, & Grube, 1984, Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990). This paper unites the value theories of Rokeach and Schwartz into an explanation of environmental concern and provides some preliminary data to support the model. The universalism value type, which takes a primary place within this model, includes the social values of "equality", "a world of beauty", "a world at peace", "social justice", "unity with nature", and "protecting the environment". The value types of benevolence and power take a secondary position.

Universalism Values: Blueprint for Environmental Concern

Belief system theory placed values at the hub of the personality surrounding the self to maintain one's self-esteem whenever necessary and to enhance one's self-esteem whenever possible (Ball-Rokeach, Rokeach, & Grube, 1984). Empirical research has consistently shown human values to be significantly related to both attitudes and behaviors (e.g. Ball-Rokeach, Rokeach, & Grube, 1984; Rokeach, 1979). Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) have built on the work by Rokeach and his colleagues and put forth a theory of the universal structure of human values. Their work has identified ten universal motivational types of values by making the assumption that values are derived from one or more of three universal requirements characteristic of the human condition--needs of individuals as biological organisms, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and survival and welfare needs of groups.

This paper unites the value theories of Rokeach and Schwartz into an explanation of environmental concern. Attitudes toward environmental choices should be determined by underlying value orientations. The universalism value type takes a primary place within this model. This values type includes the individual social values of "equality", "broadminded", "wisdom", "a world of beauty", "a world at peace", "social justice", "unity with nature", and "protecting the environment". Individuals who place a high priority on these universalism values should hold pro-environmentalism attitudes and advocate pro-environmentalism activities.

Given hard choices, belief system theory predicts an individual will act in ways consistent with the salient values held in the highest priority. Since other concerns and issues clash with environmental choices, value theory would predict that the values which underlie alternative choices may override a pro-environmental position if these values are more important to the individual than the universalism values. It is likely that other value types will temper the effect of the universalism values in this regard.

METHOD

This study utilized written survey methodology to assess the relationships between values, global consciousness, and environmental concern. Respondents completed three separate instruments during a single forty-five minute session.

Participants

Students at a small state-supported college (n = 51) and a high school (n = 59) in the same town in the Pacific Northwest were surveyed using three separate instruments during the 1992-1993 school year. Females and males made up 61.8% and 36.4% of the respondents, respectively. The sample was predominately caucasian (96%).

Instrumentation

The Values Questionnaire (Schwartz, 1992) is a 56 item instrument in which respondents indicate how important values are for them as a guiding principle in their lives, on a nine point scale. Subscores were obtained for the ten universal motivational types of values (see Table 1) by averaging the responses to the individual

values within the respective types. Subscores could vary from -1 up to 7 with higher scores indicating a higher priority placed on the value type.

Insert Table 1 About Here

The second questionnaire was a fifteen item adaption of a survey of environmental concern developed by Dunlap and his colleagues. Respondents indicated their level of agreement to the items on a five-point Likert scale. A total environmental concern score was obtained by averaging the responses to the individual items following appropriate reversal of selected items. Scores could vary from 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating a higher level of environmental concern.

The World-mindedness Questionnaire (Der-Karabetian, 1992) is a 26 item instrument. Respondents in this study indicated their level of agreement to the items on a five-point Likert scale. A total world-mindedness score was obtained by averaging the responses to the individual items following appropriate reversal of selected items. Scores could vary from 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating a higher level of world-mindedness or global consciousness.

RESULTS

The respondents exhibited levels of environmental concern (mean = 3.44, SD = .58) and world-mindedness (mean = 3.43, SD = .41) which were generally in the mid range of scores. No differences in levels

of environmental concern were noted across age, gender, and socio-economic status variables.

Pearson correlational coefficients were computed across the ten value types, world-mindedness scores, and environmental concern scores. These coefficients are presented in Table 2. Strong significant relationships were identified among environmental concern, world-mindedness, and the universalism value type. A significant negative relationship was found between the power value type and both environmental concern and world-mindedness.

Insert Table 2 About Here

A stepwise multiple regression equation was computed predicting environmental concern using the ten value type scores as predictors. The results of this analysis is presented in Table 3. The first variable entering the regression equation was the universalism type. This value type plus the value types of benevolence and power explained about 20% of the variance in environmental concern.

Insert Table 3 About Here

DISCUSSION

In extensive cross-national research Schwartz (1992) identified the universalism value type which includes the values of social

justice, broadminded, world at peace, wisdom, a world of beauty, unity with nature, protecting the environment, and equality. Individuals who place a high priority on this value type exhibit an understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.

The regression analysis identified the benevolence and power value types as mediating variables with negative loadings in predicting environmental concern. The fact that concern for social status, prestige, and dominance over people and resources (power type) is negatively related to environmental concern seems straightforward. However, given the altruistic nature motivating many pro-environmentalists, the results seems contradictory for the benevolence domain.

Stern, Dietz, and Kalof (1992) have developed a three-pronged model of environmental concern which may be relevant here. The first level is a biospheric orientation with a concern for the welfare of nonhuman species and the entire biosphere. The second level involves a concern for the welfare of other human beings. The third level is characterized by egoism or self interest.

The results of this study can be interpreted in the context of these three levels of environmentalism. In order for environmental concern to exist the universalism value type must be reasonably strong. If environmental concern at the biospheric orientation level exists, the universalism values would need to be overwhelmingly important to an individual. Schwartz (1992) defines the benevolence

value type as concern for the preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent contact. Therefore, based on the Stern et al. (1992) model the relative strength of the benevolence value type may move an individual into the second level with concern for the welfare of other human beings. The environmentalist concerned about the welfare of other human beings would prioritize benevolence values close to the universalism values. The relative strength of the power value type would likewise move an individual into the self-interest orientation noted by Stern et al. (1992). The environmentalist who is an egoist would prioritize power values at or above their priorities on universalism and benevolence values.

The results of this study clearly support the thesis that the value types of universalism, benevolence and power are predictive and important in understanding environmental concern. The three value type explanation for the three levels of environmentalism outlined by Stern et al. (1992) needs additional research to support it. Future research is needed with the value types of universalism, benevolence, and power and a more refined measure of environmental concern which identifies the three levels outlined by Stern et al. (1992) to verify this dynamic.

REFERENCES

Ball-Rokeach, S., Rokeach, M., & Grube, J. (1984). The great American value test. New York: Free Press.

Der-Karabetian, A. (1992, August). World-mindedness and the nuclear threat: A four-nation test of the superordinate goal hypothesis. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington DC, USA.

Mayton, D. M. & Furnham, A. (1991, August). Value underpinnings of antinuclear political activism: A cross national study. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California, USA.

Rokeach, M. (ed.) (1979). Understanding human values. New York: Free Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 20, 1-65.

Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 878-891.

Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal structure of human values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 550-562.

Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., & Kalof, L. (1992). Value orientations, gender, and environmental concern. Unpublished manuscript.

Table 1
Universal Motivational Types of Values (Schwartz, 1992)

Motivational Type	Definitional Phrases	Example of Values Within Each Type
POWER	Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.	social power, wealth, authority, preserving public image
ACHIEVEMENT	Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.	successful, capable, ambitious
HEDONISM	Pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself.	pleasure, enjoying life
STIMULATION	Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.	daring, a varied life, an exciting life
SELF-DIRECTION	Independent thought and action--choosing, creating, exploring.	creativity, freedom,curious, independent, choosing own goals
UNIVERSALISM	Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.	social justice, broadminded, world at peace, wisdom, a world of beauty, unity with nature, protecting the environment, equality
BENEVOLENCE	Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.	helpful, forgiving, honest, loyal
TRADITION	Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion impose on the self.	accepting my portion in life, devout, respect for tradition, humble, moderate
SECURITY	Safety, harmony and stability of society, of relationships, and of self.	family security, national security, social order, clean, reciprocation of favors, sense of belonging
CONFORMITY	Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.	obedient, self-discipline, politeness, honoring parents and elders

Table 2

Correlations Between Values
and World-Mindedness and Environmental Concern

	World-Mindedness Score	Environmental Concern Score
Value Type		
Power	-.33 **	-.28 **
Tradition	-.03	-.18
Hedonism	-.12	-.10
Stimulation	-.18	-.05
Security	-.19	-.09
Conformity	-.03	-.04
Self-Direction	.12	.15
Benevolence	.13	-.10
Universalism	.47 **	.31 **
Achievement	-.18	-.05
World-Mindedness	----	.41 **

Table 3

Stepwise Multiple Regression Results
Predicting Environmental Concern From Motivational Value Types

Value Type Predictors	Beta Weight
Universal	.388
Benevolence	-.260
Power	-.216
(Constant)	3.459
R = .454	R Squared = .206
F = 8.397, p < .0001	